



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,060	05/22/2001	William Gross	IDEALAB.012A	7383
20995	7590	04/01/2005	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/863,060	GROSS ET AL.	
Examiner	Ashok B. Patel	Art Unit	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2004.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-35 are subject to examination.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments filed November 19, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

A. Before responding to Applicant's arguments, Examiner would like to point out:

a. That although Examiner had cited particular columns and line numbers in the reference as applied to the claims for the convenience of the applicant, the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim. It is also valid that other relevant passages and figures may apply as well to substantiate the specified teachings. Therefore, it is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing response, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

b. The reference Ranalli teaches in col. 13, line 11-16, " ICANN, accessible via the Internet at [www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org), can be petitioned to adopt tel as an additional generic top level domain. As an alternative, the DNS component of the DS can be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing Generic Top Level Domains with no approval required by ICANN. "

c. Also, the reference Ranalli teaches in col. 7, lines 29-33, " FIG. 2 illustrates an example of such a record 24 stored in the directory service. The information in each

record would be indexed (mapped) to enable searching and resolution of requests based on various combinations of inputs/outputs." And Fig. 2 is as follows.

24

FULL NAME	HOME ADDRESS
TITLE {Dr., Miss, Mr., Mrs., Ms.}	STREET
FIRST	CITY
MIDDLE	STATE/PROVINCE
LAST	ZIP/POSTAL CODE
SUFFIX { I, II, III, Jr., Sr. }	COUNTRY/REGION
NICKNAME	OTHER ADDRESS
PERSONAL	STREET
BIRTHDAY	CITY
SPOUSE'S NAME	STATE/PROVINCE
ANNIVERSARY	ZIP/POSTAL CODE
PHOTO	COUNTRY/REGION
COMPANY	BUSINESS PHONE
JOB TITLE	BUSINESS MOBILE
EMPLOYEE TYPE	BUSINESS FAX
EMPLOYEE IDENTIFIER	BUSINESS PAGER
DEPARTMENT	HOME PHONE
GROUP	HOME MOBILE
PROFESSION	HOME FAX
MANAGER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
ASSISTANT	WEB ADDRESS
PHOTO	VPIM ADDRESS
USER NAME	VOIP ADDRESS
BUSINESS ADDRESS	CERTIFICATES/DIGITAL ID'S
STREET	
CITY	
STATE/PROVINCE	
ZIP/POSTAL CODE	
COUNTRY/REGION	
MAIL STOP	
BUILDING/FLOOR	
OFFICE NUMBER	

*FIG. 2*

Thereby the reference Ranalli provides motivation for solving the problems that are indicated in lines 15-20, as being, "the restricted addressing capability of a local directory severely circumscribes the utility of these new IP-enabled communication systems. The limited information contained in such local directories results in many call diversions to the PSTN, and further, increased administration costs associated with maintaining local databases.

**Claim 6:**

**Applicant's argument:**

Because Ranalli does not disclose, expressly or inherently, each claim element of independent Claim 6, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 6 is allowable over Ranalli. For example, a careful review of Ranalli completely fails to disclose:

*"a first instruction configured to determine whether a first RFC 1035 compliant address has a non-standard TLD belonging to a first set of non-standard TLD names"*

Indeed, the citation provided by the Examiner (Ranalli, column 13, lines 27-28) fails to even discuss making a determination, much less a determination as to whether an address has a non-standard TLD belonging to a first set of non-standard TLD names. Instead, column 13, lines 27-28, merely recites: "The resulting DS domain name address becomes: "2. 1.2.1.5.5.5.0.0.8.1.te1". Alternatively, the DS would also accept the format: "8005551212.1.te1".

**Examiner's response:**

As indicated in the argument, "the DS does accept the format "8005551212.1.tel" which is non-standard TLD belonging to a first set of non-standard TLD names. In order to accept the format "8005551212.1.tel", the determination has to be made inherently.

**Applicant's argument:**

Further, careful review of Ranalli completely fails to disclose:

*"a second instruction configured to append an extension, including at least a standard TLD, to the first RFC 1035 compliant address at least partly in response to the*

*first instruction determining that the first address has a non-standard TLD belonging to the first set of non-standard TLD names”*

Indeed, the Examiner failed to provide a citation to Ranalli that discloses the foregoing element, and no such citation exists in Ranalli.

**Examiner's response:**

The reference Ranalli teaches in col. 13, line 11-16, " ICANN, accessible via the Internet at [www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org), can be petitioned to adopt tel as an additional generic top level domain. As an alternative, the DNS component of the DS can be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing Generic Top Level Domains with no approval required by ICANN. "

In order to accept to implement the reference's teaching (using a sub-domain within one of the existing Generic Top Level Domains, i.e. a second instruction configured to append an extension, including at least a standard TLD), the resolution of requests based on various combinations of inputs/outputs, as indicated in Fig. 2, (to the first RFC 1035 compliant address at least partly in response to the first instruction determining that the first address has a non-standard TLD belonging to the first set of non-standard TLD names").

**Applicant's argument:**

The Examiner takes the position that the Ranalli teaches "that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request, line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD "tel" be appended by any of the ICANN compliant TLDS to resolve the IP address."

However, the citation at column 13, lines 26-27 referred to by the Examiner discloses that Ranalli "appends the ".tel" generic top level domain identifier" wherein the ".tel" would be a generic top level domain approved by ICANN. Ranalli nowhere discloses appending an ICANN compliant top level domain to a non-ICANN compliant ".tel" top level domain as asserted by the Examiner.

**Examiner's response:**

The reference Ranalli teaches in col. 13, line 11-16, " ICANN, accessible via the Internet at [www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org), can be petitioned to adopt tel as an additional generic top level domain. As an alternative, the DNS component of the DS can be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing Generic Top Level Domains with no approval required by ICANN. "

**Claim 28:**

**Applicant's argument:**

With respect to Claim 28, because Ranalli does not disclose, expressly or inherently, each claim element of independent Claim 28, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 28 is allowable over Ranalli. For example, Ranalli fails to disclose:

*a first instruction configured to determine whether a first email address for an email being dispatched by a sender contains a NON-ICANN compliant TLD name, wherein the first email address is associated with an intended email recipient;*

*a second instruction configured to form a second email address by appending an extension including at least an ICANN compliant TLD name to the first email address at least partly in response to a determination by the first instruction that the first email*

*address contains a non-ICANN compliant TLD name.*

While the Examiner takes the position that Ranalli discloses the foregoing elements at column 3, lines 5-25 and column 13, lines 17-30, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of Ranalli. For example, Ranalli, at column 3, lines 5-25 fails to even disclose characterization of Ranalli. For example, Ranalli, at column 3, lines 5-25 fails to even disclose that an email address can contain a non-ICANN compliant TLD name.

**Examiner's response:**

The reference Ranalli teaches in col. 7, lines 29-33, "FIG. 2 illustrates an example of such a record 24 stored in the directory service. The information in each record would be indexed (mapped) to enable searching and resolution of requests based on various combinations of inputs/outputs."

Please also refer to the responses provided for claim 6.

**Claim 31,**

**Applicant's argument:**

With respect to Claim 31, because Ranalli does not disclose, expressly or inherently, each claim element of independent Claim 31, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31 is allowable over Ranalli. For example, Ranalli fails to disclose: a second instruction configured to form a second email address by removing for display the predetermined domain While the Examiner takes the position that Ranalli, at column 2, lines 44-54, discloses the foregoing element.....Nowhere does this citation disclose "a second instruction configured to form a second email address by removing for display the

predetermined domain." Indeed, Ranalli does not even disclose removing an address domain when displaying an email address. Because Ranalli does not expressly or inherently describe elements in Claim 31, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31 is allowable and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow Claim 31

**Examiner's response:**

Please refer to Fig. 2 as indicated above. The reference teaches, as indicated previously, in col. 2, line 44-54, the recipient is presented with the information by their internet address by the DS. Thus in order to present the information in accordance with the recipient 's address, such as email of Fig. 2, the DS does inherently form a second email address by removing the previous address.

**Discussion of the rejections under 35 USC §103(a):**

**Applicant's argument:**

Further, the Examiner has not provided any explanation as to how installing Tout's transformation logic on the user's client terminal in Ranalli would eliminate any problems with the communication system of Ranalli. Because, whether analyzed alone or in combination, Ranalli and Tout fail to teach or suggest all the claimed elements, and because there would be no motivation to modify Ranalli with the disclosure of Tout as proposed by the Examiner, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**Examiner's response:**

As previously asserted by the Examiner in the previous office action and emphasized with an underlined text what is not explicitly taught by Ranalli, "The reference Ranalli fails to explicitly teach to receiving the first Internet address at an address converter system executing on the user's client terminal. The reference Tout teaches to receiving the first Internet address at an address converter system executing on the user's client terminal. (Fig.1, element 50). Additionally, the reference also teaches the ability to append redirector information which functions like a TLD.(col.7, lines 50-56)."

And as the office action clearly indicates " modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's transformation logic on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20." Please refer to Fig. 1, elements 1 and 2 of Ranalli for the user terminal.

Thereby the reference Ranalli provides motivation for solving the problems that are indicated in lines 15-20, as being, "the restricted addressing capability of a local directory severely circumscribes the utility of these new IP-enabled communication systems. The limited information contained in such local directories results in many call diversions to the PSTN, and further, increased administration costs associated with maintaining local databases.

**Claim 13:**

Please also refer to the explanations for the reference Ranalli stated above.

**Applicant's argument:**

Yet further, Ranalli, which fails to even mention a proxy server, fails to teach or suggest providing data corresponding to the modified first Internet address to a proxy server, so that the proxy server can provide the modified first internet address to a domain name system server," as claimed. Indeed, the Examiner has failed to provide any citation to Ranalli that teaches or suggests providing data corresponding to a modified Internet address to a proxy server, so that the proxy server can provide the modified Internet address to a domain name system server.

**Examiner's response:**

Ranalli's Fig. 3, element 12 is proxy server. Also, In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Also, as previously asserted by the Examiner in the previous office action and emphasized with an underlined text what is not explicitly taught by Ranalli.

**Claim 16:**

Please also refer to the explanations for the reference Ranalli stated above.

**Applicant's argument:**

With respect to Claim 16, the Examiner appears to take the position that Ranalli discloses receiving email having a first recipient email address with a non-standard

TLD, and adding an extension, the extension including a standard TLD, to the recipient's first email address to generate a modified recipient email address. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of Ranalli. As similarly discussed above, Ranalli fails to disclose or suggest receiving an email having a first recipient email address with a non-standard top level domain, and then adding an extension including a standard top level domain to the recipient's first email address, much less the invention as claimed.

**Examiner's response:**

The reference Ranalli teaches in col. 7, lines 29-33, "FIG. 2 illustrates an example of such a record 24 stored in the directory service. The information in each record would be indexed (mapped) to enable searching and resolution of requests based on various combinations of inputs/outputs."

**Claims 22 and 35:**

Please refer to the responses provided above for claims 6, 28, 31, Discussion of the rejections under 35 USC §103(a) and claim 16.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

*(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an*

*international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.*

4. Claims 6, 9-12, 28, 30, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ranalli et al. (hereinafter Ranalli) (US 6, 539, 077)

**Referring to claim 6,**

The reference teaches a system for accessing network resources using resource addresses in a networked environment which requires the resource addresses to have a top-level domain (TLD) name compliant with a first standard, the system comprising:

    a first instruction configured to determine whether a first RFC 1035 compliant address(Abstract, “telephone numbers), has a non-standard TLD belonging to a first set of non-standard TLD names(col.13, lines 27-28, “2.1.2.1.5.5.0.0.8.1.tel”);

    a second instruction configured to append an extension, including at least a standard TLD, to the first RFC 1035 compliant address at least partly in response to the first instruction determining that the first address has a non-standard TLD belonging to the first set of non-standard TLD names; and

    a third instruction configured to provide the first address with the appended standard TLD to a service that will convert the first address with the appended standard TLD into an IP address. (col.13, lines 17-30, the reference teaches how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt “.tel” as an additional generic top level domain, or alternatively, it teaches that it’s DS’s (directory services)

DNS component, that is “.tel”, be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request., line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD “.tel” be appended by any of the ICANN compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address).

**Referring to claim 9,**

The reference teaches the system as defined in claim 6, further comprising a fourth instruction configured to provide data corresponding to the first address with the appended standard TLD to a proxy server, so that the proxy server will provide the data corresponding to the first address with the appended standard TLD to a domain name system server for resolution. (col.13, lines 13-16).

**Referring to claims 10, 11 and 12,**

The system as defined in claim 6, wherein the first instruction and the second instruction are included in a program embedded in a web page, and The system as defined in claim 6, wherein the first instruction and the second instruction are included in a program downloadable from a web page, and The system as defined in claim 6, wherein the first instruction and the second instruction are included in a program stored on machine readable storage media. (the reference teaches the first instruction in col.13, lines 27-28, “2.1.2.1.5.5.5.0.0.8.1.tel”, and second and third instructions in col.13, lines 17-30, the reference teaches how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt “.tel” as an additional generic top level

domain, or alternatively, it teaches that it's DS's (directory services) DNS component, that is ".tel", be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request.; line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD ".tel" be appended by any of the ICANN compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address., col.16, lines 24-55 )

**Referring to claim 28,**

The reference teaches system for processing an email address having a non-ICANN compliant level domain (TLD) name, the method comprising:

a first instruction configured to determine whether a first email address for an email being dispatched by a sender contains a non-ICANN compliant TLD name, wherein the first email address is associated with an intended email recipient; a second instruction configured to form a second email address by appending an extension including at least an ICANN compliant TLD name to the first email address at least partly in response to a determination by the first instruction that the first email address contains a non-ICANN compliant TLD name; and a third instruction configured to provide the second email address so that the second email address can be submitted to a domain name system server (DNS server) via a server system to thereby locate a corresponding IP address. (col.3, lines 5-25, (col.13, lines 27-28, "2.1.2.1.5.5.5.0.0.8.1.tel", (col.13, lines 17-30, the reference teaches how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt ".tel" as an additional generic top level domain, or

alternatively, it teaches that it's DS's (directory services) DNS component, that is ".tel", be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request., line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD ".tel" be appended by any of the ICANN compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address. The reference also teaches in col.13, lines 1-10, and line 11, www.icann.org for verifying the ICANN compliant TLDs.)

**Referring to claim 30,**

The reference teaches system as defined in claim 28, further comprising a fourth instruction configured to remove the appended extension. (col.2, lines 44-54, the recipient is presented with the information by their internet address).

**Referring to claim 31,**

The reference teaches a system for processing an email address having a non-ICANN compliant top-level domain (TLD) name (col.13, lines 13-16), the system comprising: a first instruction configured to determine whether a first email address for a first received email contains a predetermined domain; and a second instruction configured to form a second email address by removing for display the predetermined domain. (col.2, lines 44-54, the recipient is presented with the information by their internet address by the DS).

**Referring to claim 33,**

The reference teaches the system as defined in claim 28, further comprising a third instruction configured to display the second email address to a user. (col.2, lines 44-54, the recipient is presented with the information by their internet address by the DS.).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 8 13-27, 29, 32, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranalli et al. (hereinafter Ranalli) (US 6, 539, 077) in view of Tout et al. (hereinafter Taut) (US 6, 182, 148).

**Referring to claim 1,**

The reference Ranalli teaches a method of accessing network resources using an Internet address having a non-ICANN compliant top-level domain (TLD) name, the method comprising:

receiving from a user's client terminal data corresponding to a first Internet address utilizing only RFC 1035 compliant characters (Abstract, "telephone numbers), the first Internet address including a non-ICANN compliant TLD (col.13, lines 27-28,

"2.1.2.1.5.5.0.0.8.1.tel"), at a user's Internet Service Provider's (ISP) domain name system server (DNS server);

receiving at the user's client terminal a negative response from the ISP DNS server in response to receiving the data corresponding to the first Internet address;(col.12, lines 58-67 and col.13, Table and lines 11-13, thus since the above indicated first internet address "2.1.2.1.5.5.0.0.8.1.tel" including top level domain .tel will produce the negative result which is also well known in the art.)

receiving the first Internet address at an address converter system executing on the user's client terminal, wherein the address converter system appends an extension, including at least an ICANN compliant TLD, to the first Internet address, thereby creating a second Internet address; submitting the second address to the ISP DNS server to locate a corresponding IP (Internet Protocol) address;

providing the corresponding IP address to a user browser; and

connecting the user browser to a system corresponding to the IP address.

(col.13, lines 17-30, the reference teaches how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt ".tel" as an additional generic top level domain, or alternatively, it teaches that it's DS's (directory services) DNS component, that is ".tel", be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request., line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD ".tel" be appended by any of the ICANN

compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address). The reference Ranalli fails to explicitly teach to receiving the first Internet address at an address converter system executing on the user's client terminal. The reference Tout teaches to receiving the first Internet address at an address converter system executing on the user's client terminal. (Fig.1, element 50). Additionally, the reference also teaches the ability to append redirector information which functions like a TLD.(col.7, lines 50-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's transformation logic on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 2,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Ranalli as stated above, the reference teaches receiving the first Internet address using an application program interface (col.5, lines 53-62). However, the reference fails to teach communicating the first Internet address from the application program interface to a first name space provider and a second name space provider. The reference Tout teaches the installation of an additional NSP (first name space provider) to function with the original NSP (second name space provider) in Winsock 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by

installing the Tout's transformation logic on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for address resolution to both NSPs as suggested by Tout. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 3,**

The reference Ranalli teaches the method as defined in claim 1, further comprising: communicating the first Internet address to a first name space provider; attempting to look up the first Internet address using the first name space provider, wherein the DNS server's negative response is received as a result of the lookup attempt; (col.12, lines 58-67 and col.13, Table and lines 11-13, thus since the above indicated first internet address "2.1.2.1.5.5.5.0.0.8.1.tel" including top level domain .tel will produce the negative result which is also well known in the art.) The reference also teaches in col.11, lines 5-11, col.13, lines 13-30, the reference teaches how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt ".tel" as an additional generic top level domain, or alternatively, it teaches that it's DS's (directory services) DNS component, that is ".tel", be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request., line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD ".tel" be appended by any of the ICANN

compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address. (communicating the first Internet address to a second name space provider, wherein the second name space provider performs the act of appending the ICANN compliant TLD to the first Internet address to create the second Internet address; transmitting a first response, indicating the second Internet address cannot be resolved, from the second name space provider; and communicating the second Internet address to the first name space provider, wherein the first name space provider performs the act of submitting the second address to the ISP DNS). The reference Ranalli fails to teach communicating the first Internet address from the application program interface to a first name space provider and a second name space provider. The reference Tout teaches the installation of an additional NSP (first name space provider) to function with the original NSP (second name space provider) in Winsock 2. (col. 4, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's transformation logic on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for address resolution to both NSPs as suggested by Tout. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 4,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Ranalli as stated above, although the reference teaches to append the non-ICANN compliant TLD which is a sub-domain of

any of the generic TLDs, the reference fails to teach the method as defined in claim 1, wherein the address converter system includes a Layered Service Provider (LSP) configured to filter Internet addresses containing non-ICANN compliant TLDs. The reference Tout teaches LSP configured to filter internet addresses for transformation. (col.4, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP configured to filter internet addresses for transformation on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 5,**

The reference Ranalli teaches the method as defined in claim 1, wherein ICANN compliant TLD names include .com, net, org, .gov, .edu, mil, .arpa, int, .biz, .info, name, .pro, .aero, museum, coop, and two lettered country codes. (col.13, lines 1-10, and line 11, [www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org) for verifying the ICANN compliant TLDs).

**Referring to claims 7 and 8,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Ranalli as stated above, although the reference teaches using the second name space provider is used to resolve addresses having non-standard TLD names as stated above, the reference fails to teach communicating to first name space provider used to resolve address having standard

TLD names and a second name space provider used to resolve addresses having non-standard TLD names. The reference Tout teaches the installation of an additional NSP which is a software layer (first name space provider) to function with the original NSP (second name space provider) in Winsock 2 (a windows socket layer that supports the first and second name space providers and interfaces a browser thereto). (col.4, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's transformation logic on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for address resolution to both NSPs as suggested by Tout. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claims 13 and 15,**

The reference Ranalli teaches a method of accessing network resources using an Internet address having a non-standard top-level domain (TLD), the method comprising: The reference Ranalli teaches in col.11, lines 5-11, col.13, lines 13-30, the reference teaches how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt ".tel" as an additional generic top level domain, or alternatively, it teaches that it's DS's (directory services) DNS component, that is ".tel", be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has

an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request., line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD “.tel” be appended by any of the ICANN compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address). (upon determining that the first Internet address's non-standard TLD is in the first set of non-standard TLDs, adding an extension, including at least a predetermined standard TLD, to the first Internet address to create a modified first Internet address; and providing data corresponding to the modified first Internet address to a proxy server, so that the proxy server can provide the modified first Internet address to a domain name system server.). Although the reference teaches to append the non-ICANN compliant TLD which is a sub-domain of any of the generic TLDs, the reference fails to teach providing to a client system a Layered Service Provider (LSP) configured to filter Internet addresses containing non-standard TLDs and to append a corresponding extension, including at least a standard TLD, thereto; and receiving at the LSP a first Internet address having a non-standard TLD, wherein the LSP determines that the first Internet address's non-standard TLD is in a first set of non-standard TLDs. The reference Tout teaches LSP configured to filter internet addresses for transformation. (col.4, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP configured to filter configured to filter internet addresses for transformation on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with “tel.com”, for example, which is sub-domain within one

of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 14,**

The reference Ranalli teaches method as defined in claim 13, further comprising updating the first set of non-standard TLDs. (col.13, lines 13-16, thereby, the reference teaches that any number of non-standard TLDs can be implemented by using sub-domain within one of the existing generic standard TLDs.)

**Referring to claim 16,**

The reference Ranalli teaches a method of processing email addresses in col. 7, lines 24) having non-standard top-level domain names, and in col.13, lines 17-30, how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt ".tel" as an additional generic top level domain, or alternatively, it teaches that it's DS's (directory services) DNS component, that is ".tel", be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request., line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD ".tel" be appended by any of the ICANN compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address. The reference also teaches in col.13, lines 1-10, and in line 11, [www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org) for verifying the ICANN compliant TLDs. (submitting the modified recipient email address to the sender's SMTP server; contacting a DNS (domain name system) server to locate a

corresponding IP address for an email server system associated with the modified recipient email address; returning the corresponding IP address to the sender's SMTP server; submitting the email to the email server system for delivery to the recipient using the corresponding IP address; and providing the email to the recipient.) The reference fails to teach using a Layered Service Provider (LSP) to intercept, on a sender's client system, email having a first recipient email address with a non-standard TLD adding, via the LSP, an extension, the extension including a standard TLD, to the recipient's first email address to generate a modified recipient email address. The reference tout teaches to receiving the first Internet address at an address converter system executing on the user's client terminal. (Fig.1, element 50). Additionally, the reference also teaches the ability to append redirector information which functions like a TLD.(col.7, lines 50-56). The reference Tout teaches LSP configured to filter internet addresses for transformation. (col.4, lines 31-67). (using a Layered Service Provider (LSP) to intercept, on a sender's client system, email having a first recipient email address with a non-standard TLD adding, via the LSP, an extension, the extension including a standard TLD, to the recipient's first email address to generate a modified recipient email address.) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP configured to filter configured to filter email addresses for transformation on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of

Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claims 17,**

The reference Ranalli teaches the method as defined in claim 16, wherein the act of submitting the email to the email server system for delivery to the recipient further comprises appending the email to an email file associated with the recipient. (col.3, lines 5-25, Appending the email is considered an inherent feature to sending the email.)

**Referring to claim 18,**

The reference teaches the method as defined in claim 16, wherein the email is provided to the recipient via an email client host on a client computer, (Fig.1, element 4).

**Referring to claim 19,**

The reference teaches the method as defined in claim 16, wherein the email is provided to the recipient via a web-based email system.(Fig.3, element 10).

**Referring to claim 20,**

The reference teaches the method as defined in claim 16, wherein the email server system includes an SMTP server and a POP server. (col.3, line 8-25. Also, it is well known in the art that POP can be used with or without SMTP, depending upon the version of POP, to send messages.)

**Referring to claim 21,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Ranalli as stated above, the reference fails to teach wherein the LSP is installed on top of a default Transport Service Provider (TSP). The reference Tout teaches LSP is installed on the top of a default TSP. (Fig.1,

element 50, col. 4, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP on the top of a default TSP and configured to filter configured to filter internet addresses for transformation on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 22,**

The reference Ranalli teaches a method of processing email addresses (col.7, lines 24) having non-ICANN compliant level domain (TLD) names (col.13, lines 27-28, "2.1.2.1.5.5.5.0.0.8.1.tel") in col.13, lines 17-30, the reference teaches how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt ".tel" as an additional generic top level domain, or alternatively, it teaches that it's DS's (directory services) DNS component, that is ".tel", be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request., line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD ".tel" be appended by any of the ICANN compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address. The reference also teaches in col.13, lines 1-10, and in line 11, www.icann.org for verifying the ICANN compliant

TLDs.) (appending at least an ICANN compliant TLD to the first email address at least partly in response to determining that the email address contains a non-ICANN compliant TLD name, thereby forming a second email address; submitting the second email address to a domain name system server (DNS server) via an SMTP server to locate an IP address corresponding to a server associated with the second email address; locating the IP address; and using the located IP address to transmit the email so that it can be accessed by the recipient.) The reference fails to teach determining on a sender's client system whether a first email address for an email being dispatched by the sender contains a non-ICANN compliant TLD name, wherein the first email address is associated with an intended email recipient. The reference Tout teaches to receiving the first Internet address at an address converter system executing on the user's client terminal. (Fig.1, element 50). Additionally, the reference also teaches the ability to append redirector information which functions like a TLD.(col.7, lines 50-56). The reference Tout teaches LSP configured to filter internet addresses for transformation. (col.4, lines 31-67). (determining on a sender's client system whether a first email address for an email being dispatched by the sender contains a non-ICANN compliant TLD name, wherein the first email address is associated with an intended email recipient.) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP configured to filter configured to filter email addresses for transformation on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-

domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 23,**

The reference Ranalli teaches the method as defined in claim 22, further comprising: receiving the email and the second email address on the recipient's client system; automatically removing at least the ICANN compliant TLD from the end of the second email address to recreate the first email address; and presenting the email in conjunction with the first email address to the recipient. (col.2, lines 23-39, col. 13, lines 13-30, The reference teaches that " the DS presents email as the address registered by the recipient".)

**Referring to claim 24,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Ranalli as stated above, although the reference teaches to append the non-ICANN compliant TLD which is a sub-domain of any of the generic TLDs, the reference fails to teach utilizing a Layered Service Provider (LSP) to filter email addresses containing non-ICANN compliant TLD names and to append at least corresponding ICANN compliant TLD names thereto. The reference Tout teaches LSP configured to filter internet addresses (email addresses) for transformation. (col.4, lines 31-67). Additionally, the reference also teaches the ability to append redirector information which functions like a TLD.(col.7, lines 50-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP configured to filter

configured to filter internet addresses for transformation on the user's client terminal such that the internet address (email addresses) utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 25,**

The reference teaches the method as defined in claim 22, transmitting the email and data corresponding to the second email address to a proxy server associated with the sender's client system. (Fig.1, elements 4 and 10).

**Referring to claims 26 and 27,**

The reference teaches the method as defined in claim 22, wherein the mail server includes a Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) server, and method as defined in claim 22, wherein the server associated with the second email address includes an SMTP server and a Post Office Protocol (POP) server. (col.3, line 8-25, Also, it is well known in the art that POP can be used with or without SMTP, depending upon the version of POP, to send messages.)

**Referring to claim 29,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Ranalli as stated above, the reference fails to teach wherein the first instruction is included in a Layered Service Provider (LSP). The reference fails to teach using a Layered Service Provider (LSP). The reference Tout teaches LSP configured to filter internet addresses (first email address)

for transformation. (col.4, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP configured to filter configured to filter email addresses for transformation such that the internet address utilizing only RFC 1035 compliant characters can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 32,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Ranalli as stated above, the reference fails to teach wherein the first instruction is included in a Layered Service Provider (LSP). The reference Tout teaches LSP configured to filter internet addresses (first email address) for transformation. (col.4, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP configured to filter configured to filter email addresses for transformation such that the internet address utilizing only RFC 1035 compliant characters can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 34,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of reference Ranalli as stated above, the fails to teach

wherein the domain had been appended by a sender client system. The reference Tout teaches to receiving the first Internet address at an address converter system executing on the user's client terminal. (Fig.1, element 50). Additionally, the reference also teaches the ability to append redirector information which functions like a TLD.(col.7, lines 50-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's transformation logic on the user's client terminal such that the internet address utilizing only FRC 1035 compliant characters such as Ranalli's telephone numbers can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

**Referring to claim 35,**

The reference Ranalli teaches a method of accessing network resources, the method comprising: using a Layered Service Provider (LSP) to identify a first Internet address having a non-standard TLD, wherein the LSP determines that the first Internet address's non-standard TLD is in a first set of non-standard TLDs; and adding an extension, including at least a predetermined standard TLD, to the first Internet address to create a modified first Internet address.

The reference Ranalli teaches a method of accessing network resources in col.13, lines 17-30, the reference teaches how to use the non-ICANN compliant top level domain by first petitioning ICANN to adopt ".tel" as an additional generic top level domain, or

alternatively, it teaches that it's DS's (directory services) DNS component, that is ".tel", be implemented by using a sub-domain within one of the existing generic ICANN compliant TLDs without an approval by ICANN. The reference also teaches that the invention has an ability to dynamically append the generic top level domain identifier to the request., line 26-27. Thus, the reference teaches the method to create a non-ICANN compliant TLD ".tel" be appended by any of the ICANN compliant TLDs to resolve the IP address. (and adding an extension, including at least a predetermined standard TLD, to the first Internet address to create a modified first Internet address.)

The reference fails to teach using a Layered Service Provider (LSP) to identify a first Internet address having a non-standard TLD, wherein the LSP determines that the first Internet address's non-standard TLD is in a first set of non-standard TLDs. The reference Tout teaches LSP configured to filter internet addresses (first email address) for transformation. (col.4, lines 31-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Ranalli by installing the Tout's LSP configured to filter configured to filter email addresses for transformation such that the internet address utilizing only RFC 1035 compliant characters can be intercepted and appended with "tel.com", for example, which is sub-domain within one of the existing generic TLDs, and be sent for accessing the DS of Ranalli. This will eliminate the current problems faced by the communication system as explained by Ranalli in col.2, lines 15-20.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp  
\*\*\*



DIANE FOLLANSBEE  
SUPPLYING PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100